

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated November 28, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-16 are rejected to by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1-3, 5, and 9-16 have been amended. Claims 1-16 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter with applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,191,838 to Muramatsu (hereinafter “Muramatsu”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,853,361 to Tsuyuki et al. (hereinafter “Tsuyuki”). Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,590,622 to Nakanishi et al. (hereinafter “Nakanishi”) in view of Tsuyuki. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,529,179 to Hashimoto et al. (hereinafter “Hashimoto”) in view of Tsuyuki.

With respect to claim 3, the Examiner rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter with applicant regards as the invention. With this response, Applicants have amended claim 3 to clarify the claim limitations cited by the Examiner. Applicants submit that claim 3 fully complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and request that the rejection to the claim under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

The Examiner objects to the title as being not descriptive. While Applicants disagree that the original title is not indicative of the invention, a new title is provided with this response. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

The rejections of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that the cited references, analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest every element of the claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a touch panel for a display device having a combination of features including “a flexible printed cable having a plurality of signal applying lines extended

from the upper and lower substrates to a rear side of the display device for applying signal voltages to the metal electrodes, wherein the flexible printed cable is bent over an edge of the upper and lower substrates from a top to a bottom of the display device, and has a first part extended from the edge of the display device to connect the signal applying lines to the plurality of metal electrodes and a second part extended from the first part and overlapping the driver IC, the first and second parts being perpendicular to each other.” In rejecting the claims, the Examiner relies on Tsuyuki to teach or suggest features of the flexible printed cable. Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference as none of the references including Tsuyuki, Muramatsu, Nakanishi, and Hashimoto, analyzed singly or in any combination, teach or suggest at least the above quoted combination of features of claim 1.

Independent claim 9 recites a method of fabricating a touch panel for a display device, including essentially the same elements quoted above and recited by claim 1. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 9 using the same rationale used to reject claim 1. Applicants' arguments with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is allowable over Tsuyuki, Muramatsu, Nakanishi, and Hashimoto for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Applicants note that claims 2-8 each depends from independent base claim 1 and that each includes by reference all of the limitations of claim 1, and that claims 10-16 each depends from independent base claim 9 and each includes by reference all of the limitations of claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2-8 and 10-16 are each allowable over Tsuyuki, Muramatsu, Nakanishi, and Hashimoto at least based on their dependencies and for the reasons given for the respective base claims 1 and 9.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37



C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 27, 2007

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No. 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants